## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA United States of America, 3 Case No.: 2:17-cr-124-JAD-EJY-3 Plaintiff 5 **Order Re: Pending Motions** V. Damien Norris, [ECF Nos. 434, 435] 6 7 Defendant 8 Damien Norris was convicted of distribution of a controlled substance after a three-day jury trial in March 2019. At his December 2019 sentencing, he was sentenced to 104 months 10 custody followed by three years of supervised release. Norris has since filed two motions. 11 First, he seeks the return of personal property, like a laptop and cell phones, seized during the 12 search of his home. And second, he asks the court to reduce his sentence under Federal 13 Sentencing Guidelines Amendment 782.4 14 Norris's request for return of his personal property is granted. The government does not 15 oppose the request and explains in response that "Counsel for the government has contacted [the 16 Drug Enforcement Agency and they are prepared to release the evidence to an authorized 17 representative of the defendant." Norris or his counsel should send a letter to Mr. Knief, 18 designating an authorized representative to take possession of Norris's items (that were not used 19 20 <sup>1</sup> ECF No. 302 (verdict). 21

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> ECF No. 418 (judgment).

<sup>22 3</sup> ECF No. 434.

<sup>3 4</sup> ECF No. 435.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> ECF No. 455.

3

12

11

16

18 19

20

21

22

as evidence or deemed contraband) and making arrangements for that representative to receive 2 those items. That letter should not be sent to the court.

Norris's request for a sentence reduction based on Amendment 782 and 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2) is denied as meritless. Title 18 section 3582(c)(2) allows a sentencing court to reduce a previously imposed sentence "based on a sentencing range that has subsequently been 6 lowered by the Sentencing Commission" in certain limited circumstances. 6 But, as the government points out in its opposition, Amendment 782 did not "subsequently" lower Norris's 8 sentencing range. That Amendment went into effect in 2014—five years before Norris was sentenced.<sup>8</sup> So, when Norris's guideline level was calculated and his sentence was imposed, the benefits of Amendment 782 were already factored in. Norris is thus not eligible for relief under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2) and Amendment 782.

**IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that Norris's Motion for Return of Property 13 [ECF No. 434] is GRANTED. Norris or his counsel must make arrangements with the government for an authorized representative to receive the non-evidentiary, non-contraband 15 items seized from Norris's home.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Norris's motion for a sentence reduction [ECF No. 435] is DENIED.

Dated: March 23, 2020

<sup>6</sup> 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> ECF No. 453.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> United States v. Navarro, 800 F.3d 1104, 1107 (9th Cir. 2015) ("On November 1, 2014, the Commission issued Amendment 782 to its Sentencing Guidelines, which lowered the recommended sentences for certain drug crimes . . . ").